AMY W. SCHULMAN
DLA PIPER LLP
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020
Telephone: (212) 335-4500
Facsimile: (212) 335-4501
amy.schulman@dlapiper.com

STUART M. GORDON (SBN: 037477)
GORDON & REES LLP
Embarcadero Center West
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 986-5900
Facsimile: (415) 986-8054
sgordon@gordonrees.com

MICHAEL C. ZELLERS (SBN: 146904)
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP
515 South Flower Street, Suite 4200
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2223
Telephone: (213) 430-3400
Facsimile: (213) 430-3409
michael.zellers@tuckerellis.com

Attorneys for Defendant
PFIZER INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE BEXTRA AND CELEBREX MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

This document relates to

ANNIE LEE THOMAS, W.T. THOMAS, and VERNELL HICKS, Heirs of the Estate of T.W. THOMAS, Deceased,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

PFIZER, INC.,

Defendant.

MDL Docket No. 1699

CASE NO. 3:07-cv-02840-CRB

PFIZER INC., PHARMACIA CORPORATION, AND G.D. SEARLE LLC'S ANSWER TO COMPLAINT

JURY DEMAND ENDORSED HEREIN

NOW COMES Defendant Pfizer Inc. (improperly captioned in Plaintiffs' Complaint as "Pfizer, Inc.") ("Pfizer" or "Defendant") and files this Answer to Plaintiffs' Complaint ("Complaint"), and would respectfully show the Court as follows:

I.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The Complaint does not state in sufficient detail when Decedent was prescribed or used Celebrex® (celecoxib) ("Celebrex®"). Accordingly, this Answer can only be drafted generally. Defendant may seek leave to amend this Answer when discovery reveals the specific time periods in which Decedent was prescribed and used Celebrex®.

II.

ANSWER

1. Defendant admits that Plaintiffs brought this civil action seeking monetary damages, but deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any relief or damages. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Decedent used Celebrex®, and, therefore, denies the same. Defendant admits that, during certain periods of time, it marketed and co-promoted Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct and denies the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph of the Complaint.

2. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations concerning Plaintiffs' citizenship and the amount in controversy, and, therefore, denies the same. However, Defendant admits that Plaintiffs claim that the parties are diverse and that the amount in controversy exceeds $75,000, exclusive of interests and costs.

3. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Decedent used Celebrex®, and, therefore, denies the same. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding the judicial district in which the asserted claims allegedly arose and, therefore, denies

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

the same. Defendant admits that, during certain periods of time, it marketed and co-promoted Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendant denies committing a tort within the States of Texas and California and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

4. Defendant admits that, during certain periods of time, it marketed and co-promoted Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendant admits that Pfizer is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in New York, that it is registered to do business in Texas, and that it may be served through its registered agent in Texas. Defendant denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

5. Defendant admits that Pfizer does business in Texas and California. Defendant admits that, during certain periods of time, it marketed and co-promoted Celebrex® in the United States, including Texas, to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendant denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

6. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations concerning Plaintiffs' and Decedent's citizenship, and, therefore, denies the same. Defendant denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

7. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Decedent's medical condition and whether Decedent used Celebrex®, and, therefore, denies the same. Defendant denies that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs or Decedent injury or damage and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

8. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.

Defendant denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

9. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Decedent used Celebrex®, and, therefore, denies the same. Defendant admits that, during certain periods of time, it marketed and co-promoted Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendant denies that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs or Decedent injury or damage and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

10. Defendant admits that, during certain periods of time, it marketed and co-promoted Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendant denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

11. Defendant admits that Celebrex® is in a class of drugs that is, at times, referred to as non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs ("NSAIDs"). Defendant admits that, during certain periods of time, it marketed and co-promoted Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendant states that Celebrex® is a prescription medication which is approved by the FDA for the following indications: (1) for relief of the signs and symptoms of osteoarthritis; (2) for relief of the signs and symptoms of rheumatoid arthritis in adults; (3) for the management of acute pain in adults; (4) for the treatment of primary dysmenorrhea; (5) to reduce the number of adenomatous colorectal polyps in familial adenomatous polyposis (FAP) as an adjunct to usual care (e.g., endoscopic surveillance surgery); (6) for relief of signs and symptoms of ankylosing spondylitis; and (7) for relief of the signs and symptoms of juvenile rheumatoid arthritis in patients two years of age and older. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

12. Defendant states that, as stated in the FDA-approved labeling for Celebrex®, "[t]he mechanism of action of Celebrex is believed to be due to inhibition of prostaglandin synthesis,

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

primarily via inhibition of cyclooxygenase-2 (COX-2), and at therapeutic concentrations in humans, Celebrex does not inhibit the cyclooxygenase-1 (COX-1) isoenzyme." Defendant states that Celebrex® is a prescription medication which is approved by the FDA for the following indications: (1) for relief of the signs and symptoms of osteoarthritis; (2) for relief of the signs and symptoms of rheumatoid arthritis in adults; (3) for the management of acute pain in adults; (4) for the treatment of primary dysmenorrhea; (5) to reduce the number of adenomatous colorectal polyps in familial adenomatous polyposis (FAP) as an adjunct to usual care (e.g., endoscopic surveillance surgery); (6) for relief of signs and symptoms of ankylosing spondylitis; and (7) for relief of the signs and symptoms of juvenile rheumatoid arthritis in patients two years of age and older. Defendant denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

13. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

14. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

15. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

16. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

17. Defendant states that the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Merck and Vioxx® are not directed toward Defendant, and, therefore, no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed required, Defendant admits that Vioxx® was withdrawn from the United States market on September 30, 2004. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

18. Defendant admits that, during certain periods of time, it marketed and co-promoted Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

19. Defendant states that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to the article for its actual language and full text. Any attempt to characterize the article is denied. Defendant admits that the sale of Bextra® was voluntarily suspended in the United States market as of April 7, 2005. Defendant denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph Complaint.

20. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

21. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

22. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Decedent used Celebrex®, and, therefore, denies the same. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

23. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant admits that it provided FDA-approved prescribing information regarding Celebrex®. Defendant denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

24. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Decedent used Celebrex®, and, therefore, denies the same. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

25. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct, denies that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs or Decedent injury or damage, and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the

Complaint.

26. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

27. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Decedent used Celebrex®, and, therefore, denies the same. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct, denies that Celebrex® is defective, and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

28. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Decedent used Celebrex®, and, therefore, denies the same. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct, denies that Celebrex® is defective, and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

29. Defendant states that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed required, Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Decedent used Celebrex®, and, therefore, denies the same. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct, denies that Celebrex® is defective, and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

30. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct, denies that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs or Decedent injury or damage, and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

31. Defendant states that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to which no response is deemed required. To the extent a response is deemed required, Defendant admits that it has duties as are imposed by law but denies having breached such duties. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

32. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct, denies that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs or Decedent injury or damage, and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

33. Defendant admits that, during certain periods of time, it marketed and co-promoted Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

34. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct and denies the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

35. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

36. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Decedent used Celebrex®, and, therefore, denies the same. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct, denies that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs or Decedent injury or damage, and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

37. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

38. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

39. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

40. Defendant denies that Celebrex® is defective and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

41. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Decedent used Celebrex®, and, therefore, denies the same. Defendant denies that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs or Decedent injury or damage and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

42. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Decedent used Celebrex®, and, therefore, denies the same. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct, denies that Celebrex® is defective, and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

43. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Decedent used Celebrex®, and, therefore, denies the same. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct, denies

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

that Celebrex® is defective, denies that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs or Decedent injury or damage, and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

44. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

45. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Decedent used Celebrex®, and, therefore, denies the same. Defendant denies that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs or Decedent injury or damage, and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

46. Defendant states that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendant states that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

47. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct, denies that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs or Decedent injury or damage, and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

Answering the unnumbered paragraph following Paragraph 47 of the Complaint, Defendant states that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed required, Defendant denies any wrongful conduct, denies that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs or Decedent injury or damage, and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint, including all subparts.

48. Defendant denies any wrongful conduct, denies that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs or Decedent injury or damage, and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

Answering the unnumbered paragraph following Paragraph 48 of the Complaint, Defendant states that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to which no

response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed required, Defendant denies any wrongful conduct, denies that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs or Decedent injury or damage, and denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint, including all subparts.

III.

GENERAL DENIAL

Defendant denies all allegations and/or legal conclusions set forth in Plaintiffs' Complaint that have not been previously admitted, denied, or explained.

IV.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

Defendant reserves the right to rely upon any of the following or additional defenses to claims asserted by Plaintiffs to the extent that such defenses are supported by information developed through discovery or evidence at trial. Defendant affirmatively shows that:

First Defense

1. The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

Second Defense

2. Celebrex® is a prescription medical product. The federal government has preempted the field of law applicable to the labeling and warning of prescription medical products. Defendant's labeling and warning of Celebrex® was at all times in compliance with applicable federal law. Plaintiffs' causes of action against Defendant, therefore, fail to state a claim upon which relief can be granted; such claims, if allowed, would conflict with applicable federal law and violate the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution.

Third Defense

3. At all relevant times, Defendant provided proper warnings, information, and instructions for the drug in accordance with generally recognized and prevailing standards in existence at the time.

Fourth Defense

4. At all relevant times, Defendant's warnings and instructions with respect to the use of Celebrex® conformed to the generally recognized, reasonably available, and reliable state of

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

knowledge at the time the drug was manufactured, marketed, and distributed.

Fifth Defense

5. Plaintiffs' action is time-barred as it is filed outside of the time permitted by the applicable Statute of Limitations, and same is pled in full bar of any liability as to Defendant.

Sixth Defense

6. Plaintiffs' action is barred by the statute of repose.

Seventh Defense

7. Plaintiffs' claims against Defendant are barred to the extent Plaintiffs and Decedent were contributorily negligent, actively negligent or otherwise failed to mitigate their damages, and any recovery by Plaintiffs should be diminished accordingly.

Eighth Defense

8. The proximate cause of the loss complained of by Plaintiffs is not due to any acts or omissions on the part of Defendant. Rather, said loss is due to the acts or omissions on the part of third parties unrelated to Defendant and for whose acts or omissions Defendant is not liable in any way.

Ninth Defense

9. The acts and/or omissions of unrelated third parties as alleged constituted independent, intervening causes for which Defendant cannot be liable.

Tenth Defense

10. Any injuries or expenses incurred by Plaintiffs or Decedent were not caused by Celebrex®, but were proximately caused, in whole or in part, by an idiosyncratic reaction, operation of nature, or act of God.

Eleventh Defense

11. Defendant affirmatively denies that it violated any duty owed to Plaintiffs or Decedent.

Twelfth Defense

12. A manufacturer has no duty to warn patients or the general public of any risk, contraindication, or adverse effect associated with the use of a prescription medical product. Rather, the law requires that all such warnings and appropriate information be given to the

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

prescribing physician and the medical profession, which act as a "learned intermediary" in determining the use of the product. Celebrex® is a prescription medical product, available only on the order of a licensed physician. Celebrex® provided an adequate warning to Decedent's treating and prescribing physicians.

Thirteenth Defense

13. The product at issue was not in a defective condition or unreasonably dangerous at the time it left the control of the manufacturer or seller.

Fourteenth Defense

14. Celebrex® was at all times material to the Complaint reasonably safe and reasonably fit for its intended use and the warnings and instructions accompanying Celebrex® at the time of the occurrence of the injuries alleged by Plaintiffs were legally adequate for its approved usages.

Fifteenth Defense

15. Plaintiffs' causes of action are barred in whole or in part by the lack of a defect as the Celebrex® allegedly ingested by Decedent was prepared in accordance with the applicable standard of care.

Sixteenth Defense

16. Plaintiffs' and Decedent's alleged injuries/damages, if any, were the result of misuse or abnormal use of the product Celebrex® after the product left the control of Defendant and any liability of Defendant is therefore barred.

Seventeenth Defense

17. Plaintiffs' alleged damages were not caused by any failure to warn on the part of Defendant.

Eighteenth Defense

18. Plaintiffs' and Decedent's alleged injuries/damages, if any, were the result of preexisting or subsequent conditions unrelated to Celebrex®.

Nineteenth Defense

19. Plaintiffs and Decedent knew or should have known of any risk associated with

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Celebrex®; therefore, the doctrine of assumption of the risk bars or diminishes any recovery.

Twentieth Defense

20. Plaintiffs are barred from recovering against Defendant because Plaintiffs' claims are preempted in accordance with the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution and by the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetics Act, 21 U.S.C. § 301 et. seq.

Twenty-first Defense

21. Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part under the applicable state law because the subject pharmaceutical product at issue was subject to and received pre-market approval by the Food and Drug Administration under 52 Stat. 1040, 21 U.S.C. § 301.

Twenty-second Defense

22. The manufacture, distribution, and sale of the pharmaceutical product referred to in Plaintiffs' Complaint were at all times in compliance with all federal regulations and statutes, and Plaintiffs' causes of action are preempted.

Twenty-third Defense

23. Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part by the deference given to the primary jurisdiction of the Food and Drug Administration over the subject pharmaceutical product at issue under applicable federal laws, regulations, and rules.

Twenty-fourth Defense

24. Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part because there is no private right of action concerning matters regulated by the Food and Drug Administration under applicable federal laws, regulations, and rules.

Twenty-fifth Defense

25. Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part because Defendant provided adequate "direction or warnings" as to the use of the subject pharmaceutical product within the meaning of Comment j to § 402A of the Restatement (Second) of Torts.

Twenty-sixth Defense

26. Plaintiffs' claims are barred or limited to a product liability failure to warn claim because Celebrex® is a prescription pharmaceutical drug and falls within the ambit of

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Restatement (Second) of Torts § 402A, Comment k.

Twenty-seventh Defense

27. Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part because the subject pharmaceutical product at issue "provides net benefits for a class of patients" within the meaning of Comment f to § 6 of the Restatement (Third) of Torts: Products Liability.

Twenty-eighth Defense

28. Plaintiffs' claims are barred under § 4, et seq., of the Restatement (Third) of Torts: Products Liability.

Twenty-ninth Defense

29. To the extent that Plaintiffs are seeking punitive damages, Plaintiffs have failed to plead facts sufficient under the law to justify an award of punitive damages.

Thirtieth Defense

30. Defendant affirmatively avers that the imposition of punitive damages in this case would violate Defendant's rights to procedural due process under both the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution and the Constitutions of the States of Texas and California, and would additionally violate Defendant's rights to substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

Thirty-first Defense

31. Plaintiffs' claims for punitive damages are barred, in whole or in part, by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

Thirty-second Defense

32. The imposition of punitive damages in this case would violate the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

Thirty-third Defense

33. Plaintiffs' punitive damage claims are preempted by federal law.

Thirty-fourth Defense

34. In the event that reliance was placed upon Defendant's nonconformance to an express representation, this action is barred as there was no reliance upon representations, if any, of

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Defendant.

Thirty-fifth Defense

35. Plaintiffs and Decedent failed to provide Defendant with timely notice of any alleged nonconformance to any express representation.

Thirty-sixth Defense

36. To the extent that Plaintiffs' claims are based on a theory providing for liability without proof of causation, the claims violate Defendant's rights under the United States Constitution.

Thirty-seventh Defense

37. Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, because the advertisements, if any, and labeling with respect to the subject pharmaceutical products were not false or misleading and, therefore, constitute protected commercial speech under the applicable provisions of the United States Constitution.

Thirty-eighth Defense

38. To the extent that Plaintiffs seek punitive damages for the conduct which allegedly caused injuries asserted in the Complaint, punitive damages are barred or reduced by applicable law or statute or, in the alternative, are unconstitutional insofar as they violate the due process protections afforded by the United States Constitution, the excessive fines clause of the Eighth Amendment of the United States Constitution, the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution, and the Full Faith and Credit Clause of the United States Constitution, and applicable provisions of the Constitutions of the States of Texas and California. Any law, statute, or other authority purporting to permit the recovery of punitive damages in this case is unconstitutional, facially and as applied, to the extent that, without limitation, it: (1) lacks constitutionally sufficient standards to guide and restrain the jury's discretion in determining whether to award punitive damages and/or the amount, if any; (2) is void for vagueness in that it failed to provide adequate advance notice as to what conduct will result in punitive damages; (3) permits recovery of punitive damages based on out-of-state conduct, conduct that complied with applicable law, or conduct that was not directed, or did not proximately cause harm, to Plaintiffs or Decedent; (4) permits recovery of punitive damages in an amount that is not both

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

reasonable and proportionate to the amount of harm, if any, to Plaintiffs or Decedent and to the amount of compensatory damages, if any; (5) permits jury consideration of net worth or other financial information relating to Defendant; (6) lacks constitutionally sufficient standards to be applied by the trial court in post-verdict review of any punitive damages awards; (7) lacks constitutionally sufficient standards for appellate review of punitive damages awards; and (8) otherwise fails to satisfy Supreme Court precedent, including, without limitation, *Pacific Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. Haslip*, 499 U.S. 1, 111 (1991), *TXO Production Corp. v. Alliance Resources, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 443 (1993); *BMW of North America, Inc. v. Gore*, 519 U.S. 559 (1996); and *State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co. v. Campbell*, 538 U.S. 408 (2003).

Thirty-ninth Defense

39. The methods, standards, and techniques utilized with respect to the manufacture, design, and marketing of Celebrex®, if any, used in this case, included adequate warnings and instructions with respect to the product's use in the package insert and other literature, and conformed to the generally recognized, reasonably available, and reliable state of the knowledge at the time the product was marketed.

Fortieth Defense

40. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred because Celebrex® was designed, tested, manufactured, and labeled in accordance with the state-of-the-art industry standards existing at the time of the sale.

Forty-first Defense

41. If Plaintiffs and Decedent have sustained injuries or losses as alleged in the Complaint, upon information and belief, such injuries and losses were caused by the actions of persons not having real or apparent authority to take said actions on behalf of Defendant and over whom Defendant had no control and for whom Defendant may not be held accountable.

Forty-second Defense

42. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because Celebrex® was not unreasonably dangerous or defective, was suitable for the purpose for which it was intended, and was distributed with adequate and sufficient warnings.

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Forty-third Defense

43. Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the equitable doctrines of laches, waiver, and/or estoppel.

Forty-fourth Defense

44. Plaintiffs' claims are barred because Plaintiffs' and Decedent's injuries, if any, were the result of the pre-existing and/or unrelated medical, genetic, and/or environmental conditions, diseases or illnesses, subsequent medical conditions or natural courses of conditions of Plaintiffs and Decedent, and were independent of or far removed from Defendant's conduct.

Forty-fifth Defense

45. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because Celebrex® did not proximately cause injuries or damages to Plaintiffs or Decedent.

Forty-sixth Defense

46. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because Plaintiffs and Decedent did not incur any ascertainable loss as a result of Defendant's conduct.

Forty-seventh Defense

47. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because the manufacturing, labeling, packaging, and any advertising of the product complied with the applicable codes, standards and regulations established, adopted, promulgated or approved by any applicable regulatory body, including but not limited to the United States, any state, and any agency thereof.

Forty-eighth Defense

48. The claims must be dismissed because Decedent would have taken Celebrex® even if the product labeling contained the information that Plaintiffs contend should have been provided.

Forty-ninth Defense

49. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred because the utility of Celebrex® outweighed its risks.

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Fiftieth Defense

50. Plaintiffs' damages, if any, are barred or limited by the payments received from collateral sources.

Fifty-first Defense

51. Defendant's liability, if any, can only be determined after the percentages of responsibility of all persons who caused or contributed toward Plaintiffs' alleged damages, if any, are determined. Defendant seeks an adjudication of the percentage of fault of the claimants and each and every other person whose fault could have contributed to the alleged injuries and damages, if any, of Plaintiffs and Decedent.

Fifty-second Defense

52. Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of abstention in that the common law gives deference to discretionary actions by the United States Food and Drug Administration under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Fifty-third Defense

53. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because Celebrex® is comprehensively regulated by the FDA pursuant to the Federal Food, Drug & Cosmetic Act ("FDCA"), 21 U.S.C. §§ 301 *et seq*., and regulations promulgated there under, and Plaintiffs' claims conflict with the FDCA, with the regulations promulgated by FDA to implement the FDCA, with the purposes and objectives of the FDCA and FDA's implementing regulations, and with the specific determinations by FDA specifying the language that should be used in the labeling accompanying Celebrex®. Accordingly, Plaintiffs' claims are preempted by the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution, Article VI, clause 2, and the laws of the United States.

Fifty-fourth Defense

54. Plaintiffs' misrepresentation allegations are not stated with the degree of particularity required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 9(b) and should be dismissed.

Fifty-fifth Defense

55. Defendant states on information and belief that the Complaint and each purported cause

of action contained therein is barred by the statutes of limitations contained in California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 335.1 and 338 and former § 340(3), and such other statutes of limitation as may apply.

Fifty-sixth Defense

56. Defendant states on information and belief that any injuries, losses, or damages suffered by Plaintiffs and Decedent were proximately caused, in whole or in part, by the negligence or other actionable conduct of persons or entities other than Defendant. Therefore, Plaintiffs' recovery against Defendant, if any, should be reduced pursuant to California Civil Code § 1431.2.

Fifty-seventh Defense

57. To the extent that Plaintiffs seek punitive damages for an alleged act or omission of Defendant, no act or omission was oppressive, fraudulent, or malicious under California Civil Code § 3294, and, therefore, any award of punitive damages is barred. Any claim for punitive damages is also barred under California Civil Code § 3294(b).

Fifty-eighth Defense

58. Plaintiffs' causes of action are barred by Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code § 82.007.

Fifty-ninth Defense

59. Plaintiffs' causes of action are barred by Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code § 82.003.

Sixtieth Defense

60. Plaintiffs' causes of action are barred by Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code § 16.012.

Sixty-first Defense

61. This action is subject to the proportionate responsibility provisions of Chapter 33 of the Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code, including (without limitation) the requirement of § 33.003 thereof that the trier of fact determine the relative responsibility of each claimant, Defendant, and responsible third-party that may be joined in the suit.

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Sixty-second Defense

62. If Plaintiffs settle with any other person or entity, then Defendant reserves the right to make a written election of credit for settlements under § 33.014 of the Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code.

Sixty-third Defense

63. Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of accord and satisfaction.

Sixty-fourth Defense

64. Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part because any alleged defect was not known or not reasonably scientifically knowable at the time the product was distributed.

Sixty-fifth Defense

65. Plaintiffs' claims are barred by their failure to comply with conditions precedent to the right to recover.

Sixty-sixth Defense

66. Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part by the doctrine of informed consent. Decedent was informed of the risks associated with treatment and willingly consented to treatment despite those risks. Specifically, Decedent gave informed consent to the prescribing physicians before taking Celebrex®, alone or in combination with any other drug(s).

Sixty-seventh Defense

67. The duty to obtain Decedent's informed consent prior to prescribing Celebrex® alone or in combination with any other drug(s) rested solely with the prescribing physicians.

Sixty-eighth Defense

68. Plaintiffs may not assert a claim against Defendant for negligent misrepresentation as Plaintiffs and Decedent did not suffer a pecuniary loss as a result of any alleged misrepresentation by Defendant.

Sixty-ninth Defense

69. Plaintiffs' claims of negligent misrepresentation are barred by the failure to justifiably rely on any alleged misrepresentation of Defendant.

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Seventieth Defense

70. Plaintiffs' claims of misrepresentation are barred because any alleged misrepresentation on which Plaintiffs or Decedent relied did not constitute a misrepresentation of material facts.

Seventy-first Defense

71. Plaintiffs' claims for breach of warranty are barred in whole or in part by the Defendant's disclaimers.

Seventy-second Defense

72. Plaintiffs' claims for breach of warranty are barred in whole or in part because Plaintiffs and Decedent are not in privity with Defendant.

Seventy-third Defense

73. Defendant asserts the defenses of expiration, limitation, and exclusion to any applicable express or implied warranty, if any be proved.

Seventy-fourth Defense

74. Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part because any warranties, if made, are excluded through course of dealing, course of performance and/or usage of trade.

Seventy-fifth Defense

75. Plaintiffs have failed to allege conduct warranting imposition of punitive damages under Texas law.

Seventy-sixth Defense

76. The standards in Texas governing the award and review of damages for non-pecuniary damages, including damages for mental anguish and pain and suffering, are impermissibly vague or simply non-existent, and are inadequate to ensure that such awards do not include amounts intended as exemplary damages, which are impermissible in a compensatory damages award.

Seventy-seventh Defense

77. Plaintiffs' claims for punitive or exemplary damages are subject to the limitations and requirements of Chapter 41 of the Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code, including the cap on exemplary damages set out in § 41.008(b).

Seventy-eighth Defense

78. Because of the lack of clear standards, the imposition of punitive damages against Defendant is unconstitutionally vague and/or overbroad.

Seventy-ninth Defense

79. No act or omission of Defendant was malicious, willful, wanton, reckless, or grossly negligent and, therefore, any award of punitive damages is barred.

Eightieth Defense

80. Defendant reserves the right to supplement its assertion of defenses as it continues with its factual investigation of Plaintiffs' claims.

V.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Defendant prays for judgment as follows:

1. That Plaintiffs take nothing from Defendant by reason of the Complaint;
2. That the Complaint be dismissed;
3. That Defendant be awarded its costs for this lawsuit;
4. That the trier of fact determine what percentage of the combined fault or other liability of all persons whose fault or other liability proximately caused Plaintiffs' and Decedent's alleged injuries, losses or damages is attributable to each person;
5. That any judgment for damages against Defendant in favor of Plaintiffs be no greater than an amount which equals their proportionate share, if any, of the total fault or other liability which proximately caused Plaintiffs' and Decedent's injuries and damages; and
6. That Defendant has such other and further relief as the Court deems appropriate.

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

September 14, 2007 GORDON & REES LLP

By: :_____/s/_____
Stuart M. Gordon
sgordon@gordonrees.com
Embarcadero Center West
275 Battery Street, 20th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 986-5900
Fax: (415) 986-8054

September 14, 2007 TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP

By: :_____/s/_____
Michael C. Zellers
michael.zellers@tuckerellis.com
515 South Flower Street, Suite 4200
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: (213) 430-3400
Fax: (213) 430-3409

Attorneys for Defendant
PFIZER INC.

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

JURY DEMAND

Defendant Pfizer Inc. hereby demands a trial by jury of all the facts and issues in this case pursuant to 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

September 14, 2007

GORDON & REES LLP

By: :_____/s/_____
Stuart M. Gordon
sgordon@gordonrees.com
Embarcadero Center West
275 Battery Street, 20th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 986-5900
Fax: (415) 986-8054

September 14, 2007

TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP

By: :_____/s/_____
Michael C. Zellers
michael.zellers@tuckerellis.com
515 South Flower Street, Suite 4200
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: (213) 430-3400
Fax: (213) 430-3409

Attorneys for Defendant
PFIZER INC.

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111